

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**KAI D. INGRAM,**

**Plaintiff,**

**V.**

B. RUDZIENSKI, et al.,

## Defendants.

**Civil No. 22-42**

**Judge Marilyn J. Horan/**

**Magistrate Judge Patricia L. Dodge**

## ORDER

Presently before the Court is Kai D. Ingram's Objection to Order Granting Defendant's Motion for an Extension of Time. ECF No. 67. Specifically, the Magistrate Judge granted the Defendants a 30-day extension of time to respond to Mr. Ingram's discovery requests. MR. Ingram requests that the Court rescind the Magistrate Judge's Order permitting Defendants additional time to respond to discovery requests and to grant Mr. Ingram's Objections. This Court will not overrule discovery Orders where there is no evidence that the Magistrate Judge has committed error or abused her discretion.

The discretion afforded a District Court or a Magistrate Judge in managing discovery is broad. “Rulings regarding discovery matters are consigned to the court’s discretion and judgment.” *Doe v. Schuylkill Cnty. Courthouse*, 343 F.R.D. 289, 293 (M.D. Pa. 2023). In general, a district “court’s decisions regarding the conduct of discovery will be disturbed only upon a showing of abuse of that discretion.” *Schuylkill Cnty. Courthouse*, 343 F.R.D. at 293 (citing *Marroquin-Manriquez v. I.N.S.*, 699 F.2d 129, 134 (3d Cir. 1983)). “This far-reaching [district court] discretion extends to rulings by United States Magistrate Judges on discovery matters.” *Schuylkill Cnty. Courthouse*, 343 F.R.D. at 293. Upon review of a magistrate judge

discovery ruling, “district courts provide magistrate judges with particularly broad discretion in resolving discovery disputes.” *Id.* A “magistrate judge’s discovery ruling ‘is entitled to great deference and is reversible only for abuse of discretion.’” *Id.* (quoting *Kresefky v. Panasonic Commc'ns and Sys. Co.*, 169 F.R.D. 54, 64 (D.N.J. 1996)). In light of the broad discretion granted to District Courts and Magistrate Judges in the management of a case and, in particular, in managing discovery matters, the Court declines to rescind Magistrate Judge Dodge’s Order. Magistrate Judge Dodge’s Order is not an abuse of discretion and is not clearly erroneous.

And NOW, this 16th day of October 2023, it is ORDERED that Kai D. Ingram’s Objection to Order Granting Defendant’s Motion for an Extension of Time, ECF No. 67, is OVERRULED.

s/Marilyn J. Horan  
Marilyn J. Horan  
United States District Judge

cc: Kai D. Ingram, pro se  
HC8003  
SCI-GREENE  
169 PROGRESS DRIVE  
WAYNESBURG, PA 15370